



## TRADITION IN ARCHITECTURE: ITS FUNCTION AND VALUE.

By ALEXANDER NISBET PATERSON, M.A. [A.].

Read before the Royal Institute of British Architects, Monday, 21st April 1902.

I N venturing, with all diffidence, to address the Royal Institute of British Architects on the subject of the Place and Value of Tradition in Architecture, in urging, as I propose to do, its vital importance as an element in all art of permanence and value, I may be accused of preaching to the converted, of, in familiar phrase, "carrying coals to Newcastle." For it is of the essence of a body such as this, of ancient place and influence, be it college, academy, or institute, to hold fast to the inheritance and teaching of former times, and even, as the past history of such institutions proves, to give these undue prominence. It will, however, be part of my endeavour to guard against this last attitude, while at the same time seeking to carry you with me in regard to the general position indicated, in the hope mainly that the far-reaching voice of the Institute—not only within our own shores but throughout the Britains beyond the seas—may thus be expressed and asserted to restrain, to counteract, to check the too easily learned, and, as I venture to think, the pernicious teachings of the so-called "new art" movement, with certain cognate developments in English architecture. It is a foolish title, of course, "the new art," and reminds one of the criticism expressed regarding a certain learned treatise that it was "both original and wise, only what of it was original was not wise, while what was wise was not original"; still, this absurd combination of words, by popular use, has come to mean something, and may therefore be allowed to pass for the present.

The particular phase alluded to I hope to take up in more detail later on; meanwhile, and before proceeding to deal with the subject-matter of my Paper, I should wish to define, as clearly as may be, the meaning of the term "Tradition," to express in few words its relation to our art, and to disentangle it from another term, another idea with which it is apt to be confounded, and which may be best expressed by the name of

Archæology. "Tradition," in the dictionary, is stated to mean "the transmission of events, doctrines, rites, &c., from father to son through successive generations, by word of mouth"; and again in the plural, "things or deeds preserved only in the memories of successive generations, and not committed to writing." Neither of these explanations altogether conveys the meaning I would—rightly or wrongly—give to the word, although the latter is somewhat near it. Yet no other word serves better to express the idea, which is briefly: the influence, both conscious and unconscious, upon us as workers in art to-day, of the methods of seeing and doing on the part of the many generations of workers who have preceded us, and who, when in life, were engaged in like problems to these which now occupy us. Tradition in this sense, as regards architecture, is two-fold, though each part is closely and indissolubly linked to the other—Tradition in Construction; Tradition in Design. As an example of the former, we have the inherited knowledge regarding the proper combination of the various materials to resist certain stresses, of the employment and necessary proportions of certain constructional forms, as the lintel or the arch; of the latter, the use of typical mouldings or groups of mouldings, the so-called "laws"—that is, the crystallisation of experience—concerning proportions and their relation each to each; of the two in combination, the intelligent and sympathetic treatment of the varying materials, marble, stone, wood, cast and wrought metals, so as to give each a special character in accordance with its inherent qualities. "But," you may say, "your 'tradition' is then but another name for *style*, and therefore unnecessarily confusing the issues." Not so, I think. Tradition does indeed include style, or rather the styles; is mainly compounded of them; but it is larger than they. Styles have their day and pass. Tradition endures; at one period weaker, at another stronger, now more conscious, now more unconscious in its influence, it remains, and must continue to do so as long as the workers of each succeeding generation learn their work from those of the preceding one, be it in workshop, studio, college, or office. Tradition can be broken only, and that at most but temporarily, when the young say, "Our fathers were fools; we know a better way than theirs," and behold the new way they have discovered is but that of their grandfathers or of other ancestors more remote, and generally misapplied.

While, on the one hand, therefore, Tradition is not to be confused with style, so, on the other, it must be clearly differentiated from archæology, "the science which treats of ancient things or antiquities," as the dictionary has it. For, with regard to this last, we must note that the archæologist's interest in an object is aroused *essentially* because of its age, and not, in any sense, because of its influence upon work of a similar nature to-day. His attitude, to be precise, is that of the scientist, not the artist, much less the art-worker.

Many old things have an intrinsic beauty of form and colour. Most have an added charm, the result of the softening and enriching effects of time, but these are, so to speak, by-products. A man may be thoroughly versed in the various schools of painting or architecture, may be able to affix its precise date and place of origin to an early Dutch or Italian picture, a scarab, or Runic cross, may even dilate on their interest, and, in a sense, their beauty, and yet have no real appreciation of composition, outline, or colour. To the archæologist, in fact, an object is not only interesting because it is old—an entirely reasonable relationship—but it is beautiful because it is old, which strictly speaking is nonsense, inasmuch as beauty is produced by one or other, or a combination of all the attributes just mentioned, composition, outline, colour, interfused with the genius of art, and age in itself can produce none of these. It is, of course, possible to be both an archæologist and an artist—the latter term being employed in its widest sense—one may even be a better artist because of one's archæological knowledge, but the combination is not essential, or even, in actual fact, common, and it is absurd, therefore, although too commonly the case, for the learned in such subjects to pose

as authorities on art matters, or that their opinion should, on account of such knowledge, carry weight.

We have been considering tradition and archæology in terms of art, and it may be well, therefore, to endeavour to define this last also, to assign to it its special characteristics. Art, then, or fine art, as it would perhaps be more correct to designate it, we may take to be, in its widest sense, the creation of the beautiful: the production, under the combined influence of thought and emotion, of an object which in that particular form or combination of forms has not previously existed, out of materials in themselves not beautiful, be they sounds, words, pigments, clay or marble, brick, stone or wood, which object, when so produced, appeals primarily to the sense of taste and to the imagination. Further, as architecture is the phase of art which more particularly concerns us, and that not as a theoretical study, but as an actual occupation, we may more closely define it, and at the same time more clearly show its relationship to the other two conceptions, by saying that art is, in this instance, the living creative interest which devotes itself to the design and erection of buildings which will satisfy the requirements, and be in accord with the sentiments, of the present time; that the art in these buildings is a necessary and natural outcome and development of similar work in the past, of which the technique is learned consciously and unconsciously through tradition, and that archæology (with history in its train) is, at best, a science by means of which we may arrive at more precise knowledge regarding certain aspects of such work.

We have now defined our terms and indicated, in outline, their mutual relationship. Before dealing at greater length with the subject which more especially concerns us—the place of tradition in the study of art—I should like to clear away any confusion which may still be possible as to what I mean by the traditional, what by the archæological standpoint, to fence off the latter from the former. For though these interests are each, of course, entirely justifiable and praiseworthy as has been already indicated, in their essence they are diverse and even antagonistic, for the one is the handmaid of art, the other of science, and unless this division be clearly understood and guarded against, while the one will make for good, the other will certainly make for evil. While admitting for the moment—a point which will be elaborated later—that architecture, of all the arts, is that which should be most guided by tradition, while claiming that under such guidance it does its best, its most living work, it is, I maintain, altogether otherwise—it is in the highest degree hurtful to such life—when the archæological spirit is permitted to predominate. Then it is that the purely scientific knowledge that a feature, a motive is old, without any reasoned appreciation of its beauty or fitness to modern needs, is sufficient warrant that it should be reproduced. Hence the gargoyles which never spouted, which would not, in fact, be allowed to do so by our modern Building Acts, the battlements which shelter from no assaults, because our protection is of the law and not by force of arms, the ponderous buttresses with no thrust to counteract, the temple porticos which shelter none from sun or rain, because they are shut off from the passer-by by iron railings, the sham gun-ports and the turrets with “no insides.” All this is but science of a kind, dry-as-dust knowledge out of place, hurting and hindering the free development of an art which, if it is to be of any use, must be living, making frank use of the constructional facilities, and reflecting the needs, the sentiments, the aspirations of the time. The archæological spirit has shown itself from time to time in all the arts; in painting, for example, there were the various eclectic schools, as that of Caracci and his followers in Bologna during the later sixteenth century, and the pre-Raphaelite movement in our own day, but especially in architecture in the various revivals. These all, in a righteous spirit of revolt against or complete denial of any existence to the art of their day, set themselves more or less vainly (as the ultimate results showed) to turn back the hands of the clock, and instead of the spirit of

generally unconscious receptivity and the single desire for beauty which should characterise the artist mind, were fain to reproduce with toilsome study and research, the work, and not infrequently the very tricks and failings, of an alien race or long-passed-away period. Actual, textual, historical accuracy to a particular phase of old work became the one method of salvation, research took the place of creative knowledge, and the tenets of history became confounded with the teachings of art. Now, if the logic of this position be inquired into closely it must surely be found to be an impossible one to hold. It cannot matter a rushlight, from the point of view of our actual work to-day, whether this bishop or that founded a particular aisle, whether a chapel was really fourteenth-century work, or was carried out a century later in the preceding style so as to be in harmony with its surroundings. That we should know with certainty if the founder's tomb is in existence or not, or even that we should be able to say that a moulding is early, late, or transitional, will not influence one iota our powers of plan and design; all such knowledge is extremely interesting and useful, no doubt, in its own sphere, but its true importance to us is, and is only, that in gaining exactness of knowledge as to such details as these, we are bound to increase our knowledge of the work itself, of the constructional difficulties and the means by which they were overcome and rendered unexpected points of interest, of the infinite variety, the enveloping harmony and the crowning beauty of the building, which through years, and maybe centuries, of growth ultimately reached the completed, the organic form in which we see it. Only—let such enthusiasm be kept under restraint when pencil and paper are taken up in facing the problems of daily practice. Do not let us take it for granted that because a feature looks well in an old building that therefore it will be equally effective if tacked on to a new front. "Old wine in new bottles" produces, as we know from excellent authority, a disastrous result, and if, in architecture, when a like essay is made, it is only the effect of the building that is destroyed as a genuine work of art, and not the building itself that is "burst," it is the more to be regretted. According to the same authority "It is the letter which killeth, the spirit which giveth life." In the spirit of the old work we admire, and which we should with all humility seek after, there are no qualities more pre-eminent than directness of aim and honesty of purpose.

Now, passing from the relationship as between archaeology and tradition to that of tradition with our art, it is just these two qualities of directness and honesty that, if we go deep enough into the consideration of the matter, we shall find to be most surely preserved by working after the methods of our more immediate predecessors. All art is subject to convention, to restriction: architecture, of all the fine arts, is most so subjected, and that under two main influences, the one immovable, unchangeable, affecting alike the work of, say, Praxiteles and Norman Shaw, the limitation of that *construction*, through which it must express itself, and which in its turn is subject to the all-pervading law of gravity; the other, as constantly changing, constantly but gradually from year to year, even from day to day, the physical, mental, and spiritual requirements of those for whose use buildings are designed, together with the effective range of constructional resources at our disposal wherewith to satisfy these requirements. The gradual gathering-up, the accumulation of the tradition of former ages has provided us, as before said, with certain methods, certain formulæ of construction—the lintel and the arch, the beam, the truss, and the vault, each in harmony with, and yet in a sense overcoming, the effects of the law of gravity, and each having a certain artistic expression of its own. From these we cannot escape; it is not possible to conceive of any other means of covering in space (which in its essence is architecture). On the other hand, it is only from our immediate predecessors, and even contemporaries, that we can gather to what extent the immediate requirements of the day must guide us in our use of these formulæ, and

at the same time what constructional resources are available for the purpose of extending their scope. Take again the question of mouldings, which, more than anything else, are the technique of architecture. The leading contours of these, and the principles regulating their use, not at one arbitrary period only, but through all the succeeding phases of architecture up to our own day, are in the gift, so to speak, of tradition. So also with what the cumulated experience of a long line of great architects has proved to be right and beautiful in proportion, that a column in stone is satisfying to the eye when its height is eight to ten times its diameter, a window opening when it is in the proportion of two squares, are facts as certain — (with many other so-called "laws" of like nature) if as difficult — to explain, as that in music the third, fifth, and octave are in harmony with the dominant. These and such as these are the traditional data with which architectural design is produced, as with the note of the scale a musical composition; and it is only when novel materials intervene, or in a particular situation — as it were, in a musical "progression" — that variations, even to the extent of discords, are admissible and, in their place, admirable.

Only it is well to be sure of the harmonies before introducing the discords. Only the master can successfully cope with the bizarre, the unexpected. Yet in that particular class of design already referred to in passing, it is the bizarre which reigns supreme, and the younger the designer the more scornfully is the whole body of traditional training set at naught.

It is often an aid to clearness of understanding regarding a particular situation if the attendant circumstances can be viewed from a different standpoint, if, as in the present case, the elements of one art can be substituted for those of another when setting forth the argument. Take, then, the case of a student of music, imagine him to publish a work which throughout should set at defiance the established harmonies, the laws, and limitations of the theory of counterpoint: would he not in so doing but offer himself as a laughing-stock, as one who, in the conceit born of ignorance, would thrust himself on public notice before learning the alphabet of his art? Is it otherwise in architecture, when the canons of the art are set at naught by the student: and the word "student" I would employ in its widest sense in that connection? Which of us would claim to have passed beyond the stage of studentship in an art which, more than any other, justifies the well-worn adage, "*Ars longa, vita brevis*"? "The assay so hard, the art so long to learn, so great the toil, so sweet the recompense."

To sum up a little at this point: you will have gathered, I trust, that while, according to my view of the matter, the influence of archæology, where its presence and meaning are not fully recognised, must be considered dangerous and generally hurtful, that of tradition makes only for righteousness. There may indeed be a bondage of tradition as of archæology, but this is impossible when (and this I take to be an essential and vital principle in the truly traditional attitude) it is accepted in its widest form, when the tradition of yesterday and even of to-day is regarded as of not less but more importance than that of the century of Wren, of the Gothic master builders, or of the Greek and Roman classics, when the tradition of steel girder, plate-glass, and electric light is accepted along with that of stone vault and flying buttress. Then only and truly do we reasonably accept and make use of such types as have been handed down to us, happy to preserve the continuity of our art by employing such as are fittest and best able to express the modern requirements which we are seeking to satisfy, while we reject those that have no longer any meaning, or which it is not possible to mould and adapt to present uses; and thus only can be preserved the nobility, directness, and singleness of aim which characterise the best of the old work.

Lastly, with regard to the present tendencies in those matters, which I venture to regard as what a Scottish minister would term the "application" of this address, the position of architecture in this country to-day, as following upon and largely the result of the remarkable



and interesting—if somewhat distracting—state of that art during the century which has just passed away. For nearly a hundred years England has followed a path all her own in such matters, with results which can scarcely be called successful. The path, in fact, has been such a one as leads through a maze: we are like to end when we emerge—if we are yet to emerge at all—very precisely where we entered. Meanwhile the neighbouring nations on the Continent of Europe have been quietly pursuing and developing the traditions of earlier times in the light of modern opportunities and requirements, guided therein by a continuous and systematic study of architecture, with the result that, as regards civil architecture in particular—that branch of the art which must bulk most largely in modern times—they are, I venture to assert, far ahead of us in achievement to-day. When the opportunity offers, France can produce the Grand and the Petit Palais des Beaux-Arts, or the new railway station by the banks of the Seine, worthy to rank as examples of art with the earlier monuments in their neighbourhood, the Hôtel des Invalides and the Louvre.

In presuming to institute comparisons—as I must do to support my argument—between the buildings just referred to and those of similar magnitude and importance produced in recent times in this country, I am, I am aware, entering on delicate ground when addressing a body which includes among its active members those who have had the opportunity of carrying out national and municipal undertakings on a scale such as we in Scotland and the provinces can only sigh for and criticise when erected. Yet you will perhaps bear with and even agree to the assertion that of modern English examples of civil architecture of the first rank few indeed, if any, can stand comparison with similar work in Paris and other European centres, in such essentials as nobility of conception, sureness and largeness of grasp, and ultimate achievement in whole and in detail—any and all, in fact, of the attributes which constitute architecture a great art. Yet the Banqueting Hall of Whitehall Palace, as far as it went, is as fine as the Louvre (and as characteristically national in sentiment); St. Paul's Cathedral finer than the Panthéon; the work of Chambers and the brothers Adam, equal, if not superior, to contemporary French work, while to-day the personal ability and enthusiasm of our own architects are not less than those of their *confrères* across the Channel. The moral surely is obvious. It is not the nation or the men that are at fault, but the point of view, the methods, and, above all, the lack of continuous tradition; while, if the doctrines of the "modern school" are to prevail among our younger men, the outlook for the future is still worse.

It is scarcely necessary in a gathering such as this to trace, in detail, the architectural history of England during the nineteenth century; a brief glance at it will suffice to render clear the argument. In the early part of the century, tradition, in this country as throughout Europe, had been continuous for more than two hundred years, when suddenly within our shores, like an epidemic or series of epidemics, the period of Revivals set in. The traditions developed from Elizabethan and Jacobean times (of which the source must be traced through Italy to Rome and Greece), and, continued by Inigo Jones, Wren, Chambers, and Adam, were in a day, as it would seem now, thrust on one side as insufficient, architecture became confounded with archaeology, and the earlier developments of art were ransacked for new inspiration. The Greek revival (the first of the race), in the beginning but the desire to purify—in the light of more correct knowledge—the lines of modern classic art, became a dogmatism when opposed in the "Battle of the Styles" by the Gothic revival which followed it. Under the sway of the latter archaeology became frankly the ruling motive in architectural art. To be mediæval was to be correct, to be correct was to be beautiful. The misconception adverted to in the earlier part of the Paper, that an object was beautiful *because* it was old—the term "old" being, however, strictly limited to a particular period—became a shibboleth. We are far enough removed, alike in time and sentiment, from the battlefield, to conclude with all

impartiality that the result, the temporary result at least, was disastrous for English architecture, and that despite the artistic power of the leaders on both sides. No one would contend for a moment that great and noble works were not produced; the Greek revival gave us Cockerell and Greek Thomson; the Gothic, Burges and Butterfield; but these and some few others were men who were greater than their creeds. Nor would I deny that in reviving and extending the knowledge of phases of architecture which had been before their time unknown or ignorantly decried, they added to and corrected the stores of tradition, leaving to us who have followed them a wider heritage of knowledge and appreciation. Yet inasmuch as the attempt to trammel and confine modern requirements within the strait limits of an earlier art was bound to meet with failure, and that meanwhile the steady development of the natural expression of these requirements in stone, and brick, and iron had been interrupted, so that when it passed, as it was bound to pass, the public and the architects alike were left in a state of confusion, the influence of these revivals must be admitted now to have been, as regards the main issues, for evil rather than for good.

The Queen Anne revival, which followed, was more in the nature of a groping after compromise between the earlier combatants than a positive creed like theirs; at least, under its influence a larger view began to prevail. Meanwhile the firm grasp on principles of design had been loosened, and liberty, except when directed by principle, readily degenerates into license, so that for a time, and that within the last decades, yet another phase declared itself, and Queen Anne became merged in the period of sketch-book architecture. The examples of old work (for still to be beautiful an object must be old) in Italy, Holland, Spain, and other countries more remote, were one by one laid under contribution, so that future students of the architecture of the later nineteenth century in this country will almost be able to settle the period of a particular building by consulting the dates on the title-pages of the works issued by Mr. Batsford.

But within the last few years the long-troubled waters have, it would seem, begun to settle, not to stagnation, but to a steady flow within their natural channel. The Value of Tradition, modern as well as ancient, has shown a tendency to reassert itself, the art of architecture, along with the crafts which nourish it, has been revived, the true principles of design are being taught with organised effort in educational centres, and but for this curious development of very recent times, which threatens to turn it again from its true course, there is good hope that English architecture during the twentieth century will again assert itself in its natural and national characteristics of dignity and refinement.

Of the doctrines of this "new art" or "modern school" there are various manifestations, and those are showing themselves, not only in this country, but in other European centres of art. Its gospel is difficult to grasp by the plain man, if only because its coherent expositors are few, its literary efforts consisting mainly, so far as can be discovered, of expressions of mutual admiration of each other's work by the confraternity in a well-known art monthly journal, or, where that fails, a periodic self-advertisement by one of them in the same publication, in the form of a description and cordial appreciation of a certain house or houses by a certain architect, written, illustrated, and signed by the architect himself. To that remarkable compilation issued from the office of the *Studio*, and comprehensively and complacently entitled "Modern British Domestic Architecture and Decoration" (though from its pages the works of very nearly all our most celebrated domestic architects are excluded), Mr. Edward S. Prior has a reasoned article by way of foreword under the heading, "House-building in the Twentieth Century." With many of his arguments I am in entire sympathy; but, to commence with, he seeks to limit the scope of English architecture to house-building, which is impossible, and which, if it were possible, would be deplorable for the country's art, and,

further, makes confusion between archaeology and the styles, so that almost his last word is the hope that architects may "cease to be purveyors of style." This, indeed, one gathers to be the one prevailing tenet of the school, that the "copying of styles" is to be avoided as a deadly sin. Why? To this simple question I should like much to receive an intelligent answer. It is, I venture to assert, the first time in the history of architecture that a like position has been taken up, for it is surely an admitted fact, which was well referred to by Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema on a recent occasion in these rooms, that, from Assyria and Egypt onwards, the architects of Greece and of Rome, of the Romanesque, Mediæval, and Renaissance times, had no other idea in their minds but, in working out constructionally their fulfilment of contemporary requirements, to copy the styles which had gone before, as they knew them. They may not, in all cases, have called it copying the style, but, consciously or unconsciously, and more generally the former, that was what they were intent on doing. Now, I would again like to ask a question. Did the work thus produced suffer, in regard to sympathy with the needs of the times, to nobility, to beauty, even to originality thereby? I trow not.

When we come to analyse the characteristics of the new movement, it is to this taboo of "the styles" that they can all be traced. The refusal to employ the formulæ thus provided has its necessary result in the prevailing baldness, the absolute lack of variety and movement in this class of work, so that the same motive which has provided a cottage-gate must serve for the fitment in a drawing-room. When all the resources of the modern orchestra, so to speak, are contemptuously ignored, and Pan's pipe—or its modern equivalent, the penny whistle—is held to be the only instrument worthy to be used by an artist, is it to be wondered at that the melody is monotonous and thin? Consider, again, the lack of mouldings: these are the sign manual of the styles and must be dispensed with, though the door to the coal-cellar and that to the drawing-room be indistinguishable except for their hinges, a single exception, however, being made to this exclusion in favour of the knife-edged cavetto or shelf-moulding, which has to serve for all occasions and in all materials irrespective of its meaning or appropriateness. The styles, especially those of our immediate predecessors of the last few centuries, are essentially the product of civilisation, the architecture of modern times is, perforce, mainly that of the city; but as recent precedents must be ignored, and architecture cannot escape from the traditional standpoint, inspiration must be sought in those Arcadian times before city life existed, with a resultant sham rusticity, an assumed simplicity of living and thinking, entirely at variance with the thoughts and habits of those whose requirements the buildings are supposed to supply, and even, if due investigation were made, with those of the designers themselves.

Such was the train of thought which forced itself upon me recently when visiting at a house of this character. Such latter-day appliances as electric bells, and even the more ancient if convenient utensils, knives and forks, seemed out of place. Modern evening dress obtruded itself as a hopeless anachronism; the costume of Eden, garments of skin and leaves, or at the most a smock frock, one felt would alone be sufficiently in harmony with the surroundings. It would seem, in fact, that the designer (if, in ignorance, the word is not misapplied), in his revolt against the dominance of archaeology and the styles, had unconsciously, no doubt, but "out-Heroded Herod," and in the search for inspiration, turned his eyes far beyond both Gothic and Classic times to the Prehistoric period pictured in *Punch*.

One more characteristic may be referred to, still the result of the same tendency; the attempt to return to the conditions of working of those earlier times when the individual worker was—or is now supposed to have been—his own master in the particular portion of the general work to which he devoted himself. The said individual worker is, of course, under present-



day conditions, unable to play the part thus allotted to him, but if he is employed not by a "firm," but by a "guild," all is right, and the utmost latitude is at once allowed to the producer in all matters of furniture and ornament, with a consequent loss of homogeneity and restfulness in the general scheme. In the absence of the "guild," the half-trained amateur—too full of art enthusiasm to consent to the drudgery necessary to acquire technical skill in execution—will do instead, and, being an artist, this must be allowed absolute independence. Cast work in metals, carving in wood and stone, anything that may be turned in the lathe or produced by the machine being modern or savouring of the styles must be set aside, and the type of building in question, when at its worst, has its general bareness relieved by an ill-considered patch-work of *repoussé* copper or mosaic panels, hammered iron grates and hinges, and stencilled painting. In all this there is, combined no doubt with a real enthusiasm, as I cannot but think, Sir, a vast amount of affectation, and art which is ruled by affectation is, by the very fact, deprived at once of any influence for good or possibility of progress.

In its origin, the movement may be healthy enough, being but the revolt, carried too far, indeed, against the hurtful dominance of archæology in art, and, were it not for the youthful enthusiasm and dogmatism which inspire it, and more especially the ease with which its tricks, without its merits, can be learned, rendering its presence, already too widely disseminated in our new schools of architecture (which have themselves no traditions of training with which to combat it), a danger to the future, it might be allowed to pursue its course in undisturbed self-complacency.

Professor Beresford Pite, in his lecture here last session, on the "Tendencies of the Modern School of Architecture," said, in reference to this new development, "That there is present, under the seeming voicelessness of the new sound, an intelligence and a purpose of expression, sincere, earnest, and useful, I am as convinced as we all now are of the single-hearted zeal of the Gothic Revivalists," an opinion with which I can entirely agree; and yet, holding the belief already expressed, that the Gothic along with the other revivals, except for the knowledge they brought us, were in the main hurtful, be the more convinced that the new phase will be so equally with its predecessors, and without their compensating advantages. It is, in fact, but another attempt to put back the hands of the clock, to imagine and to insist that our fellow mortals of to-day, and we who are here to serve them, are other than they and we are or can be; equally fallacious, equally misleading with former endeavours of the same kind, but more tempting, and more pernicious than they, in that it offers an art which may be acquired without knowledge, and consequently without drudgery.

No; a rough-cast wall, plus a mosaic panel and a *repoussé* copper name-plate, is not the whole art of architecture. In that I feel certain all will agree with me. If such is to be the ruling motive of the art in this country, the watchword of the new century, then is our last state worse than the first. Encourage the crafts by all means, give the craftsmen every liberty within their own spheres—the architect will be aided and stimulated by their co-operation and help; but his must be the guiding and controlling mind, and his work may, and often must be independent of their aid. And let it not be thought that it is by working only on such lines as we have just been touching upon, as its devotees would have us believe, that one can be earnest, or even original. I am verily inclined to believe at times that the love of originality for its own sake is the root of all evil in the pursuit of the fine arts. For indeed that, desirable quality though it be, is just one that will not come by "taking thought" for it, and if it be sought after this fashion the result is but a superficial affectation which is at the opposite pole from those solid and enduring qualities which are of ultimate value in the arts. But if the architect, instead of seeking originality, and endeavouring to take it by force of devious paths and strange revivals, is content to follow the quiet lines of tradition,

holding at the same time true to himself and the requirements and opportunities of his day, it will be found to have sought him. Future generations will see in his works the special beauties and qualities of his period just as we to-day discover them in those of our predecessors. Then, too, it will be seen that the archaic revival of the "new school" which characterised the opening years of the twentieth century was, like its predecessors of similar origin, but a temporary check in the path of progress. Progress in our art, individual, national, world-wide, we all—of whatever school—desire. Progress, as history teaches, has been ever best secured by continuity, and continuity is, after all, but another name for tradition, which thus, in a last word, establishes its place and value in this our most inspiring, most noble, most ancient, and, withal, most traditional art of architecture.

#### DISCUSSION OF MR. PATERSON'S PAPER.

The President, Mr. WILLIAM EMERSON, in the Chair.

MR. G. H. FELLOWES PRYNNE [F.], in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Paterson, said that the subject treated was of extreme interest, and he thought that most present would in the main agree with Mr. Paterson's statements. With regard to the study of the past, he thoroughly agreed with Mr. Paterson, but perhaps in his great wish to uphold the following of tradition he had rather gone on the lines of a good many others who for the past twenty years, in reading papers before the Institute and the Architectural Association, had been too ready to abuse the work of the architects who had gone before them in the century. It was a matter of evolution to a certain extent. We had been passing through an almost revolutionary period in architecture during the nineteenth century: at the same time an immense amount of good had resulted. A vast amount of good had come out of the deep study of early Classic architecture by such men as Cockerell, and he would say the same with regard to Gothic architecture. Doubtless many went to foolish extremes, but in the early phase of the revival of each style the idea of simple copyism was not unnatural; it was a sort of revolt from that hard and fast line which was set immediately before. But the ultimate outcome had been good. He did not uphold the idea that the copying in itself had been good, but the deep study given to the matter both by Classic and Gothic men in the last century had been of great service to the students of the present day. Again, some people seemed to think that because their education had been in a certain groove—either Classic or Gothic, as the case might be—therefore they must abuse those brought up in a school different from their own. That was noticeable in the Gothic phase, but it was still more noticeable at the present time. One heard the Gothic style spoken of as a thing that was

past and dead, and that there was no such thing as Gothic; but it was folly to look at art in that one-sided and narrow way. One must look at it in a much broader way. One must try to see everything that is really beautiful in the Classic and all other styles, and make that the foundation of future design. We found very often in the present day that a so-called eclecticism was neither more nor less than an excuse for absolute ignorance of the art that a man tried to follow. He was not referring to such men as the late John Sedding. In him they had a man who tried to feel for deeper things. They might not agree with everything that he did, but all would agree that he was an artist, seeing the beauty of Classic architecture, seeing the true spirit in Gothic architecture, and trying to fuse the whole together and blend them into one harmonious design. But such was not the case with many of our men and many of our writers at present. Even in the controversy with regard to the Liverpool Cathedral some very foolish things were said with regard to the styles. One did not want for a moment to confine it to Gothic, Classic, or anything else; but for one school to say that it should be a Classic design and that Gothic was dead, or for the other school to say that Classic was dead and that the Gothic should be adopted, was utterly absurd. The tendency in the profession to abuse one another's work was very unfortunate. He thought that if they looked at what was best in the work of their fellows, and tried to see the good points rather than the bad, they would find their art improving, and the architecture of the future would be imbued with the spirit of true art.

MR. W. G. WILSON [A.], in seconding the vote of thanks, said that Mr. Paterson came from Glasgow, and therefore spoke rather feelingly. The architects of Glasgow were a singularly

capable lot of men, but unfortunately they were either followers of tradition or they were men who would not be controlled in any way, either in their art or in their religion! So that he was afraid that in many ways their liberty had degenerated into license. He was in Glasgow not long ago, and was staggered to see the extraordinary emanations which had come from the brains of some of the more prominent Glasgow architects. So he thought Mr. Paterson spoke rather feelingly, although his practice was slightly in opposition to the views he expressed in his paper, because the excellent work Mr. Paterson had done bore very close traces of the study of a style somewhat unsuitable to modern domestic requirements. Mr. Fellowes Prynn had got rather away from the point. He spoke of the opposition which Gothic men manifested towards Classicists, and the other way about; but was not the true art to-day eclectic art pure and simple? In going through a garden to make a bouquet, one did not pluck all the roses nor all the primroses, but one gathered flowers of different kinds, and the result was beautiful. Glasgow man as he was, he was bound to say that the most successful men in England seemed to be imbued with that sense of restraint which his countrymen somewhat lacked. The most successful architecture of to-day was purely eclectic—architecture which it would be hard to criticise as Classic architecture and equally hard to criticise as Gothic architecture. The men had learned in both schools, and the result in many cases was eminently satisfactory. With all respect to their French and other Continental neighbours, he ventured to say that the English work of to-day showed a greater amount of individuality and method, and seemed to meet the conditions of the times in a more satisfactory way than the work in France.

Mr. H. T. HARE [F.] said that the Paper was most excellent and interesting, and he felt very strongly that it was high time such a Paper should be read in their rooms. He had listened during the last two or three years to a good many papers dealing with the other point of view, more or less advancing the idea that architects should attempt to be original; and therefore he thought that any paper which protested against the conscious effort after originality must be of very great value. The idea seemed to be prevalent that if one studied and worked upon traditional lines, it must of necessity kill all originality. That was not the case by any means. If a man possessed ability and had originality in him it would come out, although he might work in Gothic, or Classic, or Renaissance, or any other style. It did not matter what it was: they would see the originality there, although the work might be absolutely correct in all its lines. Therefore it was not necessary that one should be always striving after originality. One of the great evils

of what was called the "New Art" appeared to him to lie in the fact that the exponents of it apparently divested themselves of everything that had gone before; they stripped themselves absolutely naked and stood without anything on at all. Why a man who could afford to build a good middle-class house should be compelled to sit in a room without any mouldings, ornament, or any thing pleasant to the eye, a room got up exactly in the same style as a farmhouse or a labourer's cottage, he could not conceive. He knew a very large house in London which cost many thousands of pounds, belonging to a man of high social status, yet in the entrance hall there was a large fireplace with a gridiron hanging in it—the idea being, he supposed, that he could cook a herring himself when he came home at night! That was the sort of affectation they should protest against in the strongest way possible. Although if tradition be followed and studied it might lead in many cases to a good deal of monotonous work, it was a thing which could not possibly be avoided. That monotonous work, taken as a whole, would be much more pleasant and much more satisfactory than if it were carried out by men of medium talents working without any guiding principles at all.

COLONEL LENOX PRENDERGAST [H.A.] confessed that he was attracted by the title of the Paper; he felt that there were great opportunities connected with it, and he had not been disappointed. It was, indeed, one of the most important Papers that he, as a member of the Institute for a good many years, had ever heard read there. It was of the highest importance for those who were the professional workers in this great art, but it was perhaps of still greater importance to those who were outside, and who are in lamentable ignorance of the whole position. The poor British public never had a chance of learning the groundwork of the great science which architects were engaged in. Now and then one heard a Paper on some branch of the subject, but seldom or ever was the general public instructed as to how the architects derived their knowledge. The unfortunate thing was that in moving about this great city one saw the most terrible forgetfulness of what should be. He need only instance the two great Squares—Hanover Square and St. James's Square. If any body of men from outside or from some other country came there and saw the devastation which was taking place in those two Squares, where there were fine buildings enough of the date at which they were put up, what would they say? Look at the most abominable stuff to be seen at the corner of St. James's Square and the corner of George Street, Hanover Square. It was the public that wanted educating. If Mr. Paterson could only get at those people, we might do something better than that. But in

the meantime one came down to the Institute attracted by papers, only to find that they end in a squabble of the styles. Surely, it was a much bigger job than that! They had not to say whether Gothic was right or whether Classic was right; but what the writer of the paper had told them that evening, that it was ridiculous to neglect the traditions of a great science like architecture. They must go back, and not forget that they had something to learn. He wanted to turn the ideas of the Meeting to this, that here they had the Royal Institute of British Architects occupying a leading position, and yet somehow or other they were unable to get in touch with the general public. They must find a way, though no doubt the difficulty was enormous. Mr. Paterson's was one of the most thoughtful papers he had ever heard in the Institute. The whole question had been carefully and excellently summed up by the author where he said: "I am verily inclined to believe at times that the love of originality for its own sake is the root of all evil in the pursuit of the fine arts. For, indeed, that, desirable quality though it be, is just one that will not come by taking thought for it." Their great difficulty was this, that they were face to face with a new constructional method as applied to buildings in the shape of metal supports. They had to deal with these residential buildings in their cities, residential buildings with great shop fronts below them, all standing apparently on sheets of plate glass. That seemed to be an almost insuperable difficulty, but he did not believe that it was quite insuperable. It could be remedied, and the sooner they faced it the better. If in doing that they did not neglect that great principle which had been so admirably put before them, of not forgetting the traditions of the science, he was convinced that something would come out of it, to the satisfaction not only of the Institute, but of the public at large.

Mr. E. W. HUDSON [A.] said they were much obliged to the author for having gone so fully into the ethical part of the question, which ordinary individuals had not sufficient time to do. What perplexed him was that in tradition, as in the teachers of the present day, there were so many voices, and amongst those voices there seemed to be great confusion. Which were they to follow? Architects could not get away from the question of styles, and if they studied tradition they must to a certain extent follow either the Classic or the Gothic. There seemed to be the difficulty in getting complete originality. A hybrid style, neither the one nor the other, seemed to be a most unsatisfactory thing to arrive at, unless the fashionable system of rough-cast walls, buttressed cottages, rough woodwork and sawn beams in the drawing-room, and similar inappropriateness, was to be considered the happy medium between the

two. That was the difficulty of the ordinary mind in listening to Papers such as this. What was the practical outcome? Their own architecture might be bad, but, cosmopolitan as art might be, he did not think that they could look to the Continent or the United States for a style or a mode of dealing with construction which would give them the *ne plus ultra* of what they apparently in England were seeking to find. He would not speak of Dutch *diablerie*, of German gewgaws, nor of French frivolity of style, as seen in much civil architecture, but it seemed to him from the illustrations they saw and from the small observation he had been able to make that they could not in the capitals and the cities of the countries of Europe find much in new work which it was desirable to imitate. As regards the new methods of construction, such as those employed in the twenty-story buildings of the United States, he supposed they did not want to see steel construction developed to that extent in London. But, leaving those out of the question, the libraries and other important public buildings which had been described in that room were no doubt very excellent; but amongst our own works we might find some which were equally good. As regards originality, liberty seemed to him a great thing in art. He supposed there would be no art without liberty. In mediæval times the building certainly represented the wants of the age, and it was quite impossible to mistake a palace for a hospital or a church for a guildhall. Undoubtedly it was necessary that they should study all those things in order to produce anything which was excellent and suitable to the present time. He thought a certain injustice had been done to the Gothicists. They had been pointed at as archaeologists, as if they were the only archaeologists that existed; but on the strength of Mr. Fergusson's remarks he thought that they might say that the term archaeologist applied equally to Classic as to Mediæval reproductions. Fergusson said that in many respects the portico of the British Museum was a worse example of archaeology than the design for the Law Courts. Therefore certain justice must be done to the Gothic revival: they were not altogether the sole reproducers of things which had gone by. In London they had some instances of original architecture, but whether they were in advance of the work of those who had studied the traditions of the past closely it was not for him to say. For instance, the Grosvenor Hotel, the Charing Cross Hotel, and the old Strand Music Hall were all examples of originality; but amongst such work, or that of the so-called "New Art" designers, was there anything which they could pick out as the acme of what they should attempt to follow? If so, and a consensus of opinion were ever possible, the public might take heed to the cry, "*Eureka!*" To-day, however, as during the last century, it



was but a case of rising and waning fashion, and the people were indifferent.

THE PRESIDENT, in putting the motion, said that he thought Mr. Paterson's Paper was one of the best they had had in the Institute for many years. It was a Paper full of solid thought and very serious import. It pointed out the absolute necessity of the study of architecture, and architecture as studied by the tradition of the different phases it had gone through in former times. It entered a strong protest against nonsensical affectation and crudities of design which were called originality. He could not quite agree with Mr. Paterson's remark that the "influence of the revivals of the last century must be admitted now to have been, as regards the main issues, for evil rather than for good." The Classic revival that took place at the early part of last century was engendered by the Classic studies that men went in for at that period to a far greater extent than, as a general rule, they did now. The Gothic revival, he supposed, was caused by certain works that had been written, and possibly also by easier methods of transit; and to say that this only resulted in evil was scarcely correct. For one thing, they taught men to learn, and that, after all, was the first point. He had a strong feeling that the best sort of originality was obtained from the men who had the widest knowledge of ancient precedent, whether Classic or Gothic; men of the largest knowledge, which enabled them to be the most original. Originality that was simply caused by an affectation of avoidance of acknowledged forms of the beautiful—such as making columns of absurd proportions, and cornices with mouldings entirely different from what we have accepted as giving a good effect, without any *raison d'être* for the alterations—seemed to him to be entirely wrong. The result of the wonderful researches that were made during the course of the last century had ended in the most extraordinary developments of science. These results were not obtained by men working without having studied what had gone before—quite in opposition to the lines laid down by a certain school, which chose to ignore precedents and go back, as Mr. Paterson said, to prehistoric times. What was the use of our having examples of ancient history, ancient architecture, ancient painting, and ancient sculpture, if we were not to profit by what had gone before? He for one had entered his strong protest against that sort of theory in every address and speech which he had delivered in that room. A wide education was the thing that was most necessary for the architect. Colonel Prendergast had referred to the education of the public. As he had pointed out over and over again, the education of the public in architecture must result in the first place from the education of the architects themselves. It was only by the architects

that the public could be influenced in that way. He certainly thought that there was a more intelligent interest on the part of the public at the present moment in regard to architecture than there had been in any previous time in the history of this country. He constantly met people who had nothing to do with architecture who were most interested in the new buildings that were being erected, and could discuss them and pronounce their opinions on them, which was a thing one never heard of twenty or thirty years ago. He wished to express his very great thanks to Mr. Paterson for the exceedingly good Paper he had put before them. As he had said before, it was one of the best they had had in the Institute for many years; and it had a very serious meaning to it.

MR. PATERSON, in the course of his reply, said that he would like to enter a little protest against what he thought had been a misinterpretation of his sentiment with regard to the Gothic and Classic revivals of the last century. Both Mr. Fellowes Prynne and the President seemed to speak as though he had altogether decried them; and he would very strongly deprecate that view of the matter. He was bound to say, however, that he still thought that while the adherents of the various styles had been quarrelling and fighting they had been losing their balance and were liable to fall to the ground, and, as Colonel Prendergast said, the public were left without a guide. Mr. Fellowes Prynne had quite rightly cautioned architects in general against abusing the work of their fellows; still there were times when it behoved one to speak out. He felt very strongly that the present tendencies of the modern school were, unless checked—and he believed the voice of the Institute would help to check it—likely to do harm to the progress of architecture in this country to an even greater degree than the wrangling of the styles on either side had done harm. As to the position of English civil architecture as against Continental architecture—a point in his Paper that had been criticised—one of the speakers had said that there were as good buildings in England as those that were spoken of on the Continent, but did not proceed to particularise. In his Paper he had given buildings in Paris to compare with; and he should like to know the buildings which for nobility and greatness of conception, as instances of civil architecture in which the details were worked out, could be compared with them. Take the conception, the design, and the execution of the iron staircase of the Grand Palais. He ventured to think that there were very few, if any, architects who could draw it in this country, while, if they did, they could not get a workman to carry it out. He thought that was due to the lack of traditional training.



Mr. HUDSON said that he referred to civil architecture generally in Paris as compared with our new architecture in London. In boulevard after boulevard there was no attempt at style of any kind.

Mr. PATERSON, continuing: Of course, in every country there was a mediocrity of architecture. The outstanding work of genius must in all cases be the exception. The outstanding work of the genius was the flower of the particular art of the particular period of a particular nation, and for purposes of comparison he ventured to suggest that if they took the flower of the art on one side they must bring up the flower of the art on the other. He quite admitted the monotony and lack of interest of much of modern French civil architecture, but he also maintained that it was better than the blatant vulgarity of much we have in this city. Mr. Wilson, his compatriot and fellow-townsmen, had raised the question of the suitability or otherwise of Scottish domestic architecture for modern needs. He had very strong feelings on the subject, and would be glad to take up the cudgels on behalf of Scottish domestic architecture, as he had done in writing before now, but that was a side issue and could not well be dealt with now. Mr. Wilson had also alluded to the outstanding examples of the "New Art" in Glasgow. That, of course, was just why he had taken up the subject—at least, that was one of the main reasons for doing so, because the thing, while by no means confined to that city, was so much in evidence there. At the same time, he would venture to ask Mr. Wilson if he had any special authority for referring to these buildings as being by prominent Glasgow architects? In conclusion, while expressing his disappointment that the meeting had not produced someone to maintain the other side and to answer the questions asked in the course of the Paper, Mr. Paterson desired to acknowledge very heartily the close attention and very cordial appreciation which the President and members generally had accorded to his attempt to think out the subject.



9, CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 26th April 1902.

## CHRONICLE.

### Public Decorations for the Coronation.

The following letter sent from the Institute appeared in *The Times* of the 16th inst. :—

*To the Editor of The Times.*

SIR,—It is to be hoped that on this exceptional occasion the opportunity will not be lost of endeavouring to raise the style of our festal decorations to something higher and more artistic than has generally been seen on similar occasions in London, and that those who are concerned in the erection of triumphal arches and other decorative trophies will think it worth while to seek the assistance of eminent artists for their design, instead of being content, as we too generally are in England, with the mere commonplaces of trade furnishers.

It is recorded in Vasari's life of Jacopo Sansovino, that on the occasion of a State entry of Leo X. into Florence, in 1514, the streets and principal buildings, and notably the then blank façade of the Duomo, were decorated by Sansovino and his friend Andrea del Sarto, working in collaboration, with such success as to elicit general admiration, and even induce the Pope to express a wish that the temporary façade of the Duomo had been the permanent design.

At the entry of Charles II. into London at the Restoration it is evident that some exceptional efforts were made to give architectural character to the decorative erections, for there are in the Crace collection engravings of four designs for triumphal arches, to be erected in Leadenhall Street, at the Royal Exchange, in Wood Street, and at Whitefriars. The original drawings of these designs are in the "Burlington-Devonshire Collection" in the library of the Royal Institute of British Architects, and, though unsigned, are evidently the work of an able hand.

Surely such precedents are worth taking to heart on the present occasion. A trophy designed by an eminent painter and sculptor, or painter and architect, or by eminent men in the three arts working together, would be likely to have a very

much greater interest and a higher artistic quality than can be hoped for from decorative erections carried out on a merely commercial basis.—We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

WILLIAM EMERSON, *President*

ALEXANDER GRAHAM, *Hon. Secretary* } R.I.B.A.  
W. J. LOCKE, *Secretary*

#### Special Elections to Fellowship.

At the meeting of the Council on the 21st inst., the following gentlemen, being Presidents of Allied Societies, and found by the Council to be eligible and qualified for membership under the Charter and By-laws, were, under the proviso to By-law 9, elected to the Fellowship of the Royal Institute:—

ARTHUR HARRISON, *President of the Birmingham Architectural Association*, of 109 Colmore Row, Birmingham.

ARTHUR WAKERLEY, *President of the Leicester and Leicestershire Society of Architects*, of 14 Market Place, Leicester.

#### The April Statutory Examinations.

Statutory Examinations of persons seeking to qualify for candidature as District Surveyor under the London Building Act, or as Building Surveyor under Local Authorities, were held in the rooms of the Institute on the 17th and 18th inst. Four candidates presented themselves and were examined—viz., three in the District Surveyors' and one in the Building Surveyors' Examination. Two among the former passed—viz.

THOMAS HANDY BISHOP, jun. [A.], of Leighton Buzzard.

ARTHUR MARYON WATSON [A.], B.A., of 9 Nottingham Place, W.

These gentlemen have accordingly been granted by the Council Certificates of Competency to act as District Surveyors under the London Building Act.

#### The British School at Rome.

The Council have voted an annual grant for five years of twenty guineas to the British School at Rome.

This School was started on a very modest scale about eighteen months ago, the aim of its promoters being to provide for Rome an institution on the same lines and in many respects with the same mission as the British School at Athens. To quote Professor Lanciani when addressing the Institute in November 1900, on the occasion of his Paper on the recent Excavations at the Forum, the idea is to provide somebody in Rome who will take care of English students. Whether they come from the Universities or as students from art academies or similar institutions, they

will find someone in Rome ready to help them, to smooth their way, to direct their first steps, to introduce them to the proper authorities, and to give them a shelter if they need one. He advised the authorities at home not to send archaeologists alone. The School will prove of the greatest practical advantage to architectural students. France especially has found that there is much to be learned from the old architecture of Rome, and inspirations to be gathered there. Though in Greece we may get the foundation of artistic feeling, of whatever is beautiful and ideal and admirable, it is from the ancient buildings of Rome that we may learn how to apply the principles of Greek art to the needs of civic life. The School, in fact, is less predominantly classical and archaeological than the sister School at Athens, the galleries, libraries, churches, museums, &c., of Rome, affording scope for the widest range of study.

#### The President at Cardiff.

The President, Mr. William Emerson, was the principal guest at the Annual Dinner of the Cardiff, South Wales, and Monmouthshire Architects' Society, held on Saturday, the 12th inst. Replying to the toast of "The Royal Institute of British Architects," Mr. Emerson urged upon architects the desirability of combination through the Institute and its allied branches. The end and aim of the Institute were to promote the advancement of architecture, and to look after the interests of the profession. England was behind every other European country in architectural education, and one of the chief objects of the Institute and its members should be to educate the public in its appreciation of what was best in architecture. Thanks to the Examinations organised by the Institute, decided strides had been made in the education of the rising generation of architects. The Examinations were largely taken advantage of, and every year saw an increase in the number of candidates. They wanted, also, to educate architects themselves to have some self-respect and *esprit de corps*, especially upon the burning question of competitions. All sorts of competitions were started by public bodies nowadays, and many of them were grossly unfair. There seemed to be a large number of architects ready to rush into any competition, and they made their work so cheap that they seemed to be ready to cut one another's throats. While they did that they could hardly expect the public to value their work as it ought to be valued, nor was it to be wondered at if public bodies expected them by these competitions to turn out their work as if they were machines. He knew of one case in which the plans sent in could not have cost less than £50 each set, and the total value of the plans in the competitions was £3,000, whilst the

value of the commission for the successful competitor was not more than £2,000. Architects should not enter competitions unless those asking for them were prepared to pay a proper fee for each set sent in. Another matter that the Institute had under consideration was the appointment of assessors, whose assistance in competitions had been valuable. Out of thirty-nine cases in which the assessors were appointed by the Institute only two had proved unsatisfactory, whilst of the seventy or eighty cases in which the assessors had been appointed by others 17 per cent. had caused dissatisfaction. Architects suffered a great deal from rush of work. They wanted more time for reading and study. They ought to spend more time in this way, and to learn the lessons that were available in nature—in the colours, in the flowers, in the valleys, and in the hills. They ought to aim at a love of the beautiful. If they did that they would no more sit down and design some of the things to be seen in the streets of large towns than they would design a warehouse and call it a palace.

#### Architectural Copyright in France [p. 296].

Monsieur Charles Lucas [*Hon. Corr. M. Paris*], in a letter of the 19th April addressed to the Secretary R.I.B.A., writes:—

J'ai vu avec plaisir l'intérêt porté par l'Institut royal des Architectes britanniques à la promulgation de la loi française du 11 mars 1902 étendant aux architectes, aux statuaires et aux sculpteurs et dessinateurs d'ornement l'application de la loi des 19-24 juillet 1793 sur la propriété artistique; mais la note parue à ce sujet dans le *Journal de l'Institut royal des Architectes britanniques* (*Chronique*, p. 296) me suggère deux observations que je crois devoir vous soumettre.

La première, c'est que non seulement la Société Centrale des Architectes français, mais encore la Caisse de Défense mutuelle des Architectes, la Société des Architectes diplômés par le Gouvernement, l'Association provinciale des Architectes français et l'Union syndicale des Architectes français ont, pendant ces dernières années, joint leurs efforts à ceux de la Société Centrale pour obtenir cette application aux architectes des bienfaits de la loi des 19-24 juillet 1793, et que les délégués de ces Sociétés ont accompagné les présidents successifs de la Société Centrale, MM. A. Normand et C. Moyaux, de l'Institut de France, dans les nombreuses démarches officielles et officieuses qu'ils ont faites dans ce but auprès de membres du Parlement et de fonctionnaires du Gouvernement.

La seconde, c'est que s'il est dans les habitudes

du législateur de laisser le plus souvent chaque loi former un ensemble restant tel qu'il a été voté, et si c'est aux jurisconsultes à compiler et à compléter les textes, j'ai dû demander à un membre du conseil judiciaire de la Caisse de Défense mutuelle des Architectes, M. Maurice Tassin, avocat à la Cour d'appel de Paris, de compléter dans un *mémoire judiciaire* sur la Propriété artistique des œuvres d'architecture, qu'il veut bien préparer pour les membres de ce syndicat, le texte de cette loi des 19-24 juillet 1793, et je pense que les premiers alinéas de ce texte, ainsi complété, et que je vous transcris ci-dessous, peuvent avoir quelque intérêt pour nos confrères anglais.

*Texte de la Loi des 19-24 juillet 1793 modifiée et complétée par les Lois du 14 juillet 1886 et du 11 mars 1902.*

Art. 1<sup>er</sup>.—Les auteurs d'écrits en tous genres, les compositeurs de musique, "les architectes, les statuaires,"\* les peintres et dessinateurs, qui feront graver des tableaux ou dessins, jouiront durant leur vie entière du droit exclusif de vendre, faire vendre, distribuer leurs ouvrages dans le territoire de la République et d'en céder la propriété en tout ou en partie.

"Le même droit appartiendra aux sculpteurs et dessinateurs d'ornement, quels que soient le mérite et la destination de l'œuvre."†

Art. 2.—"La durée des droits accordés par les lois antérieures aux héritiers, successeurs irréguliers, donataires ou légataires des auteurs, compositeurs ou artistes, est portée à cinquante ans, à partir du décès de l'auteur."†

#### MINUTES. XI.

At the Eleventh General Meeting (Ordinary) of the Session 1901-1902, held Monday, 21st April 1902, at 8 p.m., the President, Mr. Wm. Emerson, in the Chair, with 14 Fellows (including 6 members of the Council), 20 Associates (including 1 member of the Council), 2 Hon. Associates, and visitors, the Minutes of the Meeting held 7th April 1902 [p. 298] were taken as read and signed as correct.

The Secretary announced the results of the April Statutory Examination [p. 319].

Mr. Alexander N. Paterson [A.I., M.A., having read a Paper entitled "TRADITION IN ARCHITECTURE: ITS FUNCTION AND VALUE," a discussion ensued, and a vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Paterson by acclamation.

The proceedings then closed, and the meeting separated at 9.40 p.m.

\* Adjonctions apportées par la loi du 11 mars 1902.

† Modification apportée par la loi du 14 juillet 1886; la loi de 1793 portait seulement dix ans.

